

## Hearing Transcript

<b>Project:</b>	Morgan and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farms Transmission Assets
<b>Hearing:</b>	Issue specific hearing 1 - Part 4
<b>Date:</b>	30 April 2025

**Please note:** This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

## **M&M\_30APR\_ISH1\_PT4**

Created on: 2025-04-30 15:02:35

Project Length: 01:24:24

File Name: M&M\_30APR\_ISH1\_PT4

File Length: 01:24:24

### **FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)**

00:00:05:02 - 00:00:22:09

Okay. It's 5 to 4 if we can, uh, reconvene and, uh, moving on to the next section of the cable route, which is the connection to existing Penwortham substation. So if you could give an explanation of the scope of works at that location,

00:00:23:27 - 00:00:43:06

be great. And if you could I know we've been we've been referring to the sort of numbers, books, numbers. But perhaps if you could just describe the works, it'd be a bit more informative for people who aren't familiar with the with the numbers as well. That might help a bit, I think. Thank you.

00:00:50:29 - 00:01:19:06

Uh, so, Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicant, um, you'll see here that the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor does diverge, with two cable circuits going into the eastern. Connecting at the eastern section of them, and two cable circuits connecting at the western section of Penwortham. Um, the reasoning for this, um, is because, uh, sorry, one second,

00:01:21:06 - 00:02:00:22

um, is due to the anticipated locations of the connection bays at the National grid. Um, Pamela, which is works number 3333 b the area in grey. It must be noted that either project can install their cables on either cable corridor. And this is to allow for that flexibility that I've just outlined. Um, another point to probably raise is you will see that the cable corridor widens to the approach of the National Grid substation, and this is to provide the required flexibility to connect into those allocated bays, which will be part of the detailed design flexibility is also required.

00:02:01:00 - 00:02:09:26

Owing to the presence of the high pressure gas pipeline in the southern part of the um western side of the cable corridor.

00:02:10:02 - 00:02:14:24

Can you actually indicate with that ease, please? High pressure gas main.

00:02:18:09 - 00:02:24:14

The high pressure gas pipeline is within works number 37 A 37 B.

00:02:24:27 - 00:02:26:14

So it's not actually marked on there.

00:02:26:19 - 00:02:31:19

No. It's within the crossing schedule. I can find the identification if that is helpful.

00:02:32:07 - 00:02:38:10

That'd be quite useful to actually see where that actually runs. Yes, that'd be good. Thanks. But finish your explanation first.

00:02:39:10 - 00:03:09:21

Um, there is also, um, a temporary working area, which is the light greeny blue color identified and works number 48 A, 48 B, which are working areas to facilitate the 400 kV grid connection cable corridor at up to them. And you'll also note that there is a large area of 1818 B to the south of Penwortham, and that is also to facilitate two construction compounds, one for Morgan and one for Morgan.

00:03:10:02 - 00:03:19:11

During the detailed design stage, these will be sited within the overall area and will be dependent on National Grid's potential proposals to extend the existing substation.

00:03:20:22 - 00:03:37:05

Okay, so I've got a few questions basically on that. So, um, coming away from the rebel, presumably that's the open cut along both legs of the proposed cable routes.

00:03:42:14 - 00:03:46:26

Or is there, are there any lengths of trenches crossing on any of those sections?

00:03:48:26 - 00:04:12:09

Laura Martin, on behalf of both the applicants, um, we have the option to use open cut and trenches techniques and areas of trenches techniques, as we've already identified, are shown in the onshore crossing schedule, and there are areas along both of these which will be crossed by trenches techniques due to the presence of utilities and also, I think a woodland.

00:04:13:08 - 00:04:16:24

So on the other sections, what will determine which technique you actually use

00:04:18:23 - 00:04:24:20

or is it solely dictated by obstacles that you meet that you change technique.

00:04:30:12 - 00:04:32:08

And you just repeat your question. Please.

00:04:32:10 - 00:04:54:21

No, I was just wondering you you've got the option of trench less or, um, trench technique. Um, you explained that there are some obstacles which you'll probably be using a trench less technique to negotiate. Are there other lengths where, um, you'll be using trench less or trenching which are the lengths?

00:04:59:06 - 00:05:02:28

Or is is everything else? Trench in trench. Open cut.

00:05:08:18 - 00:05:12:18

Okay. Can I just clarify that? Do you mean across the whole of the route or in this particular.

00:05:12:20 - 00:05:34:07

I'm just talking about this location on the on these on these two cable routes. You've got the option to use trench or open cut. Presumably you're going to use trench less where you got obstacles like. Yes. Got services. Yes. And those are the only locations that you're going to use. Yes. Yes.

00:05:34:13 - 00:05:34:28

Yes.

00:05:35:00 - 00:05:36:19

If I confuse you with my question.

00:05:36:21 - 00:05:48:10

Yeah. No, it's as you say, it's crossing obstacles. Uh, environmental considerations, where required. And also, to a certain extent, there's very undulating terrain, and they're also.

00:05:49:09 - 00:05:49:27

Okay.

00:05:50:13 - 00:06:24:13

Um, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, we have got the crossing schedule. Uh, now, if you're happy for us to show it, which shows where the high pressure gas pipeline is in respect to that work. And I think the the sorry just to say the reason there is the ability to do trench or trench in that work number is because it's quite a broad work. Um, it's quite a broad work area in that it um, it hasn't been sectioned up. So there may be sections that are trenched and there may be sections that are trench less where we've committed to trench less.

00:06:24:15 - 00:06:42:13

Those are shown in the crossing schedule. Um, so it'll be clear as to where those points are, but there may be sections in between, uh, trench crossings that are within a single work number, and therefore there may be sections of that that are trenched as well. Does that make sense?

00:06:42:15 - 00:06:43:19

Yes. Thank you.

00:06:46:22 - 00:07:00:27

Okay. So you've got the you've got the drawing showing the gas main on there, um, bringing down the western side of the existing substation. So it looks like it crosses into the compound area at the bottom there.

00:07:01:26 - 00:07:15:23

Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicant, it's identified in the with the bright green um line, um, under the, um, obstacle crossing reference of.

00:07:18:02 - 00:07:27:08

MG mc under um underscore gcc UT 1805.

00:07:28:15 - 00:07:29:20

Right. Okay.

00:07:32:02 - 00:07:47:20

So yeah. So it runs down into the, uh, the, the big compound area that was shown on the other of the drawing from the western side of the substation. It runs down into the compound area. So that's something you have to work around Contained within within the company.

00:07:47:22 - 00:08:18:18

Laura Martin. On behalf of the applicants. So can we go back to the schedule? Mr. Johnson? Um, we have identified that within the temporary construction compound. You are right. And that's MC MC, MC, GC, TCC, UT 19626. And we wouldn't, um, see any issues because a temporary construction compound is above ground and the gas pipeline is below ground.

00:08:19:26 - 00:08:30:10

Okay. Thank you. So going back to the connection into this National Grid substation. Have you a connection agreement with National Grid?

00:08:33:23 - 00:08:38:00

Or are you in the middle of negotiating one or what's the current position with that?

00:08:57:16 - 00:09:11:23

I'm Liz Dunn on behalf of the applicants. This might sound like a slightly strange answer, but the applicant's connection to Penwortham is noted on the National Grid's tech register. That's about as much as I can say, apparently.

00:09:12:24 - 00:09:13:12

Okay.

00:09:14:28 - 00:09:16:11

Cryptic, but, uh.

00:09:16:27 - 00:09:17:15

Yes.

00:09:17:23 - 00:09:20:07

Okay, I'll take that.

00:09:25:00 - 00:09:29:27

So you don't know if there's an agreed connection date? There's a follow up question to that, then.

00:09:39:11 - 00:09:47:16

Uh, list down on behalf of the applicants. Um, I believe that is also on the tech register. Um, and, um,

00:09:49:07 - 00:09:54:24

uh, we can provide that information, um, for deadline one for the tech register, if that's useful.

00:09:54:26 - 00:09:56:06

Just that would be very useful.

00:09:56:08 - 00:09:57:18

Thank you. Thank you very much.

00:09:58:14 - 00:10:07:02

Okay. And then the other question I had concerned that the compound, the, um, what's compound. So how is that accessed?

00:10:11:06 - 00:10:17:07

Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicants, are you referring to the compound south of Penwortham substation?

00:10:17:10 - 00:10:17:25

Yes.

00:10:18:13 - 00:10:24:19

Um, so it's accessed via 19 A and 19 B to that that works area there

00:10:26:10 - 00:10:27:07

to the south.

00:10:28:06 - 00:10:42:05

I remember on our site inspection we actually drove through that area and that's quite a busy junction area there. But um, anyway, I just, uh, just wanted to confirmation that's how it's going to be accessed.

00:10:45:02 - 00:10:50:14

Laura Martin, on behalf of the applicants, it is a left in, left out and that's how it will be managed.

00:10:50:16 - 00:11:00:28

Okay. Thank you. That's more for traffic and sports, which we'll probably come back to at some later date. Okay. I'll open it up then to other people if they've got any questions about the connection.

00:11:02:24 - 00:11:04:23

Actually, the cables into the substation.

00:11:07:17 - 00:11:10:02

I can see someone online and LDRs.

00:11:11:09 - 00:11:14:06

Hello? Yes. Louise Staples from the National Farmers Union.

00:11:16:06 - 00:11:22:22

Um, please, could I just ask something? Did I understand it correctly? Are we saying that

00:11:24:14 - 00:11:29:24

they will need to keep the applicant? We'll need to keep two routes in for the connection,

00:11:31:22 - 00:11:35:21

and even keep the flexibility that even when they've been told.

00:11:37:11 - 00:11:48:26

I don't know when the connection might be that Morgan might go and connect one way with an overhead line, and then Morgan might use the other route and have another overhead line going into the other side. Have I understood that correctly?

00:11:49:11 - 00:11:53:00

Uh, not quite, but I'll invite Mr. to explain.

00:11:53:02 - 00:12:27:05

Yeah. List down on behalf of the applicant. Um, just to be clear, there's no overhead lines. Um, coming through, um, in this project, um, 32 A and 32 B and 37 A and 37 B are two up to two underground cables. Uh, one set of cables per project. Uh, that will then connect into the National grid substation, either on the east side or the west side. Um, the applicants will be told by National Grid which side of the substation they connect into.

00:12:27:21 - 00:13:01:20

And, uh, again, just from experience, these things can change. So committing to entry, uh, into one side of the National Grid substation, which may well then get changed, uh, can be quite problematic during examination. And given it's effectively the same set of infrastructure. Uh, it's two cables in either corridor. It's only up to two cables in either corridor. And it will just be then for National Grid to determine whether a project A takes 37 A, 37 B or A all the other way around.

00:13:02:12 - 00:13:03:10

Okay. Thank you.

00:13:04:01 - 00:13:05:04

Laura, for the applicant.

00:13:05:06 - 00:13:40:16

Can I just, um, also add to that that we have some controls in the DCO in relation to this in requirement five, which specify at requirement five six that, uh, neither work number 32 A or 37 A, uh, in in respect to Morgan and then the same in respect of Morgan. Those works cannot commence until, um, notification has been submitted to the relevant planning authority confirming whether Morgan will construct either 32 A or 37 eight, so they have to give clarity over which route they will take before those works can commence.

00:13:40:22 - 00:14:18:13

Uh, for each project and also there is a restriction through requirement 510 and requirement 511 in relation to those works which confirm that you can only ever lay two circuits down each side. So on the works plan, because it shows them as 32 A, 32 B, and that project and the descriptions in schedule one specify that for A for the 32 A for Morgan that would be up to two circuits. And for Morecambe that would be up to two circuits for 32 B with them put a restriction in the through the requirements just to clarify that that would never actually amount to four cables in each side.

00:14:18:15 - 00:14:23:25

You would only have a late two cables. So it would either be Morgan's two cables or Morecambe's two cables.

00:14:25:13 - 00:14:30:11

I'm sorry if I'm understanding that correctly. That does mean you need the two legs then. Yeah.

00:14:30:18 - 00:14:31:10

So yes.

00:14:31:12 - 00:14:46:19

So if the two projects proceed, then you. It wouldn't be a scenario where you just have one leg with the full no tickets. So that means there would be connections if both projects proceed to both sides of the solicitation.

00:14:46:24 - 00:14:47:19

That's correct.

00:14:47:24 - 00:14:48:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:14:49:06 - 00:14:59:00

Uh, Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicants. And that is dictated by National Grid, that National Grid are saying one project would go one side and one project would go the other side.

00:14:59:17 - 00:15:00:20

Okay. Thank you.

00:15:02:11 - 00:15:02:27

Yes.

00:15:03:06 - 00:15:28:13

In terms of the works to the substation itself, they're not part of this application. As I understand it. They're for National Grid. I presume there's no details of any application or consent that is needed for that at the moment. Is there any more detail about what actually. I think I've seen reference to extension works. I think that's as far as the detail seems to go. Is there any more detail about what works are expected to take place to the existing substation.

00:15:28:23 - 00:15:36:04

Lays down on behalf of the applicant? We're not aware of anything in the public domain regarding that. So it would be a question for National Grid.

00:15:39:16 - 00:15:44:06

Okay. Any other questions about the connection to National Grid substation?

00:15:48:03 - 00:15:52:08

No. Well, the National Farmers Union, have you still got your hand up or is that.

00:15:52:10 - 00:16:08:10

A yes, please. Can I? Yeah. Louise Staples for the NFU. Can I just confirm? So have National Grid already stated they want two routes in with only two circuits in each? Was that an absolute. So it was never possible to do one route in with full circuit.

00:16:10:05 - 00:16:11:28

I miss Dan, could you confirm that?

00:16:15:11 - 00:16:44:10

It was done on behalf of the applicants. That isn't for National Grid to specify, um, how the applicants, um, route into the substation. It's a matter for the applicants. However, what National Grid have said is that one project will connect to the west, and one project will connect to the east, and therefore there needs to be a connection in that can't traverse across for obvious reasons, can't traverse across through the National Grid substation itself in terms of running cables through there.

00:16:44:24 - 00:16:54:13

Okay. Thank you. I think that clarifies it. Thank you. Thank you. Any other questions? If not, we'll move on to the the substations.

00:16:56:05 - 00:16:59:23

So if you could take us through the works, propose that the substations.

00:17:27:27 - 00:18:00:24

And if it would help, um, if I tell you the questions, the questions. So you can actually, uh, put them in your description, basically, or cover them off in your description. So, um, basically what technology is proposed for each of the substations, gas or any instance of the installation? Um, if a decision has been made on the technology when we wouldn't be made, um, explain the areas in the order limits for the two substations.

00:18:00:26 - 00:18:13:09

Why why the the size they are basically. And, um, I think this came up earlier, but if you can cover it off again, why why not a single shared substation?

00:18:33:02 - 00:19:03:17

Hillary Williamson on behalf of the applicant. And I think as we were speaking to, um, earlier today with the site selection aspect, whilst there was a coordinated site selection approach between the applicants, um, there are there are obviously two separate substation projects. So I will speak to the Morgan onshore substation and my colleague Ian Mackay will speak to the Morecambe onshore substation. Um, if if you like I'll, I'll go through a description of the Morgan onshore substation.

00:19:03:19 - 00:19:08:20

I think some of the questions you've asked are answered within that. And then we can do the Morecambe one.

00:19:08:29 - 00:19:11:16

Yes. That's you do Morgan Lynn Morgan. That sounds.

00:19:11:18 - 00:19:43:23

Okay. Great. Um, so the Morgan onshore substation, um, contain will contain the electrical equipment components for transforming the power supply from the offshore wind farm to 400 kV, and that's required by the UK Grid Code for supply to the national grid. The onshore substation houses auxiliary equipment and facilities for maintenance and control. So the onshore substation, which is work number 21 a yes, contains electrical equipment, cables, lightning protection mast.

00:19:43:25 - 00:20:21:26

A lot of this is outlined in the project description, which is section 3.15.7 of As 024. And the onshore substation building structure is likely to comprise steel frames, external sheet cladding materials. Um. Some of that is detailed within the outline design principles, which are app 2009 and that relates specifically to the onshore substation. The outline design principles set out the consideration that informs the detailed design of the works at each of the onshore substations, so it does apply to both the Morgan and the Morecambe onshore substations.

00:20:23:09 - 00:20:30:16

Um, that's secured by requirement for substation works of the Draft development consent order, which is as 004.

00:20:33:00 - 00:21:05:19

Um, in line with one of the questions that you that you asked, um, to reduce the size of the onshore substation footprint. Uh, the Morgan onshore substation, um, which I would have covered in the site selection, uh, topic if allowed to monologue, um, has committed to a gas insulated switchgear design. This is primarily in response to section 42 consultation feedback um received primarily by Fylde Council, but obviously by the local communities that um the the onshore substation footprint was too large.

00:21:06:10 - 00:21:41:29

Um, as part of the commitment to move to the east to remove us, the Morgan substation, from residential properties, uh, there was a commitment made to essentially a bespoke layout. Um, so some very early design work by the onshore substation team for Morgan so that we could fit into a land parcel which previously was not deemed, um, as appropriate. Um, however, because of the sighting of that, we did we did some early, uh, supply chain engagement. Um, that meant that we reduced the onshore substation footprint from 95,000m<sup>2</sup> to 80,000m<sup>2</sup>.

00:21:42:25 - 00:21:54:11

Um, that reduction is primarily because of that rearrangement of equipment and also because of the commitment to gas insulated switchgear through that engagement of the supply chain.

00:21:56:16 - 00:22:09:15

Um, because we are a gas, because the Morgan onshore substation is a gas insulated switchgear, the main equipment is either housed in single or multiple buildings. Um, there are also some smaller buildings required to house equipment and control rooms.

00:22:11:13 - 00:22:30:08

A temporary construction compound is required at the onshore substation, which is work number 22. A temporary compound will provide offices, welfare facilities, storage of plants and equipment, and parking for construction staff, as well as temporary works such as drainage associated with that temporary works area.

00:22:32:00 - 00:23:08:05

Um, on the figure, I hope you can make out their work number 39 or cross the temporary construction compound. And that has been provided for the undergrounding of a six kV low voltage overhead line. And that said, the construction and operation traffic has an unimpeded access from the temporary construction compound to the onshore substation platform. Those discussions are progressing with the undertaker. Well, that's the end of you. Um, permanent and temporary access, um, is illustrated by work numbers 23 A and 24 A, respectively.

00:23:08:07 - 00:23:44:04

So 23 is permanent and 24 is temporary. And they are taken to the north of the Morgan Onshore substation site from the Kirk and bypass the A483, The new access road, which is work number 23. A, is required to provide safe operational access to the onshore substation and access for the abnormal indivisible loads. Essentially, the delivery of the large transformers the land identified includes for visibility, splays and temporary working areas, which is 18 a um on either side, um uh, to establish that access.

00:23:44:23 - 00:23:57:11

Um and the commitment to that to that access, the design of that access is outlined within the outline Highway Access Access Management plan as 052 and secured by requirement ten of the draft DCO.

00:23:59:24 - 00:24:41:24

The onshore substation area, um, has been cited to the west of Newton, with scales in Dow Brook to avoid the air of separation associated with the Greenbelt west of Newton with scales. Um, as I

touched upon in relation to some of the greenbelt we covered earlier. Um, although I think we might also pick some of that up tomorrow in relation to landscape and work. Numbers 28, 21, eight and 49 A include replacement and additional landscaping that will be required to mitigate the impact of the onshore substation and management of the landscaping and mitigation, including tree planting, enhanced hedgerows and the creation of water attenuation features such as ponds.

00:24:42:21 - 00:25:16:07

Um is there to, um, ensure the integrity of the planting and long term screening effect is maintained for the onshore substation, and the commitment for those is um, so the design outline design for those is within the outline landscape management plan, which is as 050 and secured by requirement six, provision of landscaping, um, the Outline Ecological Management Plan EP 212 and secured by requirement 12, the draft Eco and the Operational Drainage Management Plan, which is secured by requirement 1020 of the draft DCO.

00:25:17:10 - 00:25:48:09

Um, one minor point of clarification, um, that was picked up. Um, you might have noticed that onshore and offshore, part one and two, um, of the works plans, um, and onshore and intertidal, part one and two of the works plans have a, have a typographic error in relation to the onshore cabling work entering into the substation, uh, into and entering into the onshore substation site. Uh, part two incorrectly identifies work number 25 instead of work number 17 uh, which is shown on screen.

00:25:48:11 - 00:25:51:12

That should not be 25 A that should be 17 A.

00:25:55:13 - 00:26:31:06

Uh, so then going specifically to the questions that you raised, technology, I think I've outlined on that and therefore no decision to be made size. I've provided, um, the onshore substation footprint. Um, I think it's, it's important to outline that, that reduction from 95 80,000m<sup>2</sup> isn't explicitly spelt out within the annex on site selection. Um. However, I think it's important to illustrate the commitment there because the increased land take is more associated with the bespoke mitigation that's required to make that effective.

00:26:31:09 - 00:26:37:04

For the move from of the Audenshaw substation, from from the west to the east. Um.

00:26:37:23 - 00:26:44:18

It's a point of clarification. So the order limits reflect the gas, uh, technology substation.

00:26:46:14 - 00:27:30:25

Um, so the so work number 21 A is is is not the size of the onshore substation footprint. It it is not 80,000m<sup>2</sup>. I mean, that's that overlap isn't explicitly illustrated anywhere. If you look to the outline landscape management plan, you might see that work. Number 21 A has some landscaping features within it. And that is to provide that design flexibility. Whether we move the substation more to the east or more to the west. And that's again dependent on the entry of the onshore cables from 17 A about how we get from 17 A into 21 A crossing the public right of way, which is identified by.

00:27:31:00 - 00:27:33:03

It's not on that one. Sorry. Um.

00:27:35:08 - 00:27:38:03

That number. Sorry. Um.

00:27:42:09 - 00:27:47:19

It's 3030 for a 40 and 41 a.

00:27:55:27 - 00:28:27:15

And to your point on, um, why not a single shared substation? Um, I partially touched upon this, um, this morning in relation to the coordination Asian peace. I think the primary driver about, um, putting it in immediate proximity to one another is driven by citing an official substation, most appropriately so that is to do with the constraints identified for available land parcels. Obviously, the Morgan onshore substation is larger than the Morecambe onshore substation.

00:28:28:01 - 00:29:02:18

Um, and so the constraints mapping identifies an appropriate location for that within the zone that was in the coordinated site selection process. And that means that the landscape mitigation plan that is proposed for the Morgan onshore substation, and also the more onshore substation, is bespoke to those aspects. It means that if only one project was to come forward at a later date, it is in its best location rather than in a somewhat strange or inappropriate if it's. If there's a gap in it might not make sense in the landscape if only one was to come forward.

00:29:03:01 - 00:29:14:17

Were they placed immediately adjacent to another? Notwithstanding the fact that we didn't, we weren't able to identify a land parcel that was large enough to accommodate both onshore substations immediately adjacent to one another.

00:29:16:24 - 00:29:32:24

Okay. And there was no opportunities to reduce the footprint by I know they've got to be electrically separated, but they couldn't. The footprint couldn't have been reduced by some sharing of infrastructure, joint infrastructure.

00:29:36:16 - 00:30:09:17

Um, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Um, the requirement to be completely electrically separate means that sharing of infrastructure is not appropriate in terms of any overlap of the onshore substation footprints. They need to be able to, um, they need to be able to operate completely independently. And that functions through from both the onshore export cable as it enters the onshore substation, and then also leaves as the converted 400 kV. Um, so there is no possibility of sharing the electrical infrastructure.

00:30:10:06 - 00:30:44:01

Um, at the at the section 42 consultation stage, we did consider sharing accesses, operational accesses. Um, but actually the way that the, the comments that came back was that the access, um, the accesses to be considered on lower lane were not appropriate. Um, and it was more appropriate to consider

separate accesses, partly for construction reasons, but also operational reasons to take from the north for Morgan and to take from the south from Morecambe. And that means that we do not have a proliferation of construction traffic effects, um, falling onto one particular highway link.

00:30:44:20 - 00:30:52:14

Um, that was the process that we went through, um, post section 42 consultation. We believe that is appropriate to come to that conclusion.

00:30:53:21 - 00:31:25:20

Okay. Just one of the question I had, and that was around visual representations of the substations. Um, Now you've actually settled on a technology. Um, I think it'd be fairly easy for you to actually do a visual representation of that. Um, in fact, a lot of the residents in the open floor hearing were actually, uh, highlight at that point and said that they haven't seen anything. Um, why haven't you produce something like that? Is it something you could produce?

00:31:26:06 - 00:31:57:20

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant. Uh, layouts have been visualized in the photo montages in volume three figures, part 6 or 7, which is app one, three, six. So those are rendered images of the onshore substations, both Morgan Onshore substation and Morecambe Onshore substation as an aid to the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment chapter. I have the reference to that right now. Um, I should add that that is a tool for landscape and visual impact assessment and is not a full representation of the design.

00:31:57:22 - 00:32:05:22

It is an indicative layout and it is an indicative Rendering. Um, so that has been produced and is available.

00:32:06:25 - 00:32:12:04

Okay. Thank you. I think we'll move on then to Malcolm before opening it up to wider, wider discussion.

00:32:14:18 - 00:32:43:09

Okay. On behalf of the Morcom project, um, I'm going to talk you through, uh, the works plans, and then I'll address the specific questions that you, uh, you raised at the start. So looking at the works plans, 17 B are onshore cable works as they enter the substation and move in then to 21 B, which is the main permanent substation area that is encompassed by an area of environmental mitigation, which is 20 B

00:32:44:29 - 00:33:19:06

uh and the substation uh permanent area uh, for construction purposes is encapsulated by temporary compound area, which is 22 B as well. You'll also note works 24 B, which is a link, uh, for access between the temporary compounds, um, in terms of accesses themselves. The main construction access noted as 23 B would be from the 5848584, and so that would facilitate the construction of the substation itself.

00:33:19:14 - 00:33:59:24

We do have a permanent access which is off Lower Lane, and it should be pointed out that is not for any construction element that is purely for lights, good vehicles, cars, etc. undertaking routine inspections of the substations which will be unmanned. Um, as we move down to the south of the substation platform, you will notice works 25 B that is where our 400 kV um cable corridor will exit the substation. That area is is broad at this stage because until we've done detailed design, we will not be able to pinpoint exactly where the 400 kV connections would come out of the substation.

00:34:00:05 - 00:34:40:20

Um, it should also be noted that we will be crossing Dow Brook through commitment zero two. Um, and that will be by train technique. And then as we then move further to the east. Our aims were to to join up again with the Morgan works for the 400 K V 25 A as quickly as possible, but we do need some additional space there to facilitate the treacherous crossing as well. So that's the driver for the sort of extra width, um, in that place in terms of technology requirement, um, the Markham project has not yet made a decision, um, on the AIS or GIS technology.

00:34:41:02 - 00:35:07:19

Um, that will be done at the detailed um design phase and will be, um, accompanied by some detailed analysis with supply chain, including equipment availability and whole life costing exercises as well done at detailed design. So at the stage that the Morgan project is at just now, we have not undertaken detailed analysis with that supply chain to be able to categorically make a decision on the technology that we have

00:35:09:15 - 00:35:39:25

considering. Um, further, in terms of refinements that we've made, um, so following the section 42 consultation process, um, we made a commitment to reduce the building height. So for the purposes of statutory consultation, a maximum height of 20m was presented for Morcom. And we have been able to make a commitment as a project to reduce that down to 13m as a maximum building height, and that is reflected in the visualisations which, um, my colleague Mr. Williamson alluded to.

00:35:40:14 - 00:35:47:19

I'm sorry, just before going on and that's consistent. If a decision was made to use gas technology you can.

00:35:47:21 - 00:36:21:08

Well that the maximum. So the maximum height of 30m, the eyes or GIS technology could be encapsulated within that maximum height. So whatever technology is selected, it would never go above that maximum height. And I think coming on to the document app to unknown Outline Design Principles document, I think it's important to say as the project moves through the detailed design phase, there will be a final detailed version of that document which is produced, which at that point Morecambe would have selected a technology and we would have a really detailed substation layout.

00:36:22:12 - 00:36:41:04

The landscape mitigation would have progressed and we can get into discussions around the exact appearance of the substation as well in terms of colour schemes, fencing, etc. as well. So I just want to point to that extensive work that's done at the post consent phase, uh, to to create the most appropriate design for substation.

00:36:41:06 - 00:36:45:12

Y, is that at the post consent stage, could that be done before the examination closes.

00:36:46:15 - 00:37:13:01

The. Well, so what we have at this stage is an outline document which covers off key principles of design. But I think until we've undertaken that detailed analysis of supply chain, including the selection of the technology, we wouldn't be able to produce a detailed design document, because in essence, we wouldn't know the exact details of the substation at that point. I think that we come back to the kind of maximum design approach which is taking an EIA, and.

00:37:13:03 - 00:37:22:05

I've got some more questions tomorrow on the landscape visual section of the substation, which we could probably continue this discussion then, because we've got a few questions for you on that tomorrow.

00:37:23:03 - 00:38:00:21

Yes. And probably in the same vein, I was going to ask you obviously looked at each substation, uh, separately with regard to environmental mitigation and, um, landscaping. Um, how have you looked at it, at them holistically? Obviously one or both could go ahead. Um, but in the scenario where both get consented. Have you looked holistically at the design of both to get an integrated approach? The visual aspect of them, or have you have you just done separate?

00:38:01:07 - 00:38:32:00

Uh, Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Um, so because of the joint site selection, the coordinated and align site site selection process. Um, the zonal approach has meant that both onshore substations are sited within the lane, the same landscape character area. Um, what this means is that our outline design principles apply to both onshore substations, although they do differ slightly. They will adhere to the same design principles. Um, in terms of detailed design and how they get to a final detailed design.

00:38:32:14 - 00:39:07:08

Um, this then translates obviously into the landscape management mitigation. Sorry outline landscape management plan. Um, where the two currently do, uh, speak to one another because of that, that shared landscape character area and, and the need to obviously have a bespoke mitigation for their siting. Um, but in essence, because of the need for an effective mitigation, they are it is for the mitigation as it stands, they need to be able to stand alone rather than necessarily being a cumulative landscape mitigation plan.

00:39:07:23 - 00:39:34:18

Yeah. Yes, I appreciate that. And we will probably come on to this tomorrow. Um, it's it's just, um, what I was thinking of basically with the two technologies and then you obviously got two very different looks to the substations and, you know, how do you get something in the landscape that fits in the landscape with two different technologies, two different types of building? But we'll cover that tomorrow anyway.

00:39:34:20 - 00:39:47:18

So Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, that is precisely what the outline design principles only need to do, so that it demonstrates that they do fit within the landscape and and respond to the landscape management plans.

00:39:48:29 - 00:40:21:25

Les Dunn on behalf of the applicant, it's also worth just pointing out that it's the same outline design principles document for both projects. So there isn't a. Whilst Mr. Williamson's been focusing on the sort of bespoke landscaping around the substations which do need to take account of their very specific locations, um, and operate as mitigation for those locations, the design principles, um document applies to both substations. So there's a consistency of approach or both.

00:40:21:27 - 00:40:41:05

The potential for a consistency of approach across both those those projects in terms of the design principles, they are the same. Um, and clearly as the projects come forward, they'll need to have regard in so far as there's indivisibility between them, they would need to kind of have regard to that as as they come forward.

00:40:42:06 - 00:40:52:00

Okay. Thank you. Okay. I'm going to open you up now to others to to comment on on the actual substations. Got any comments? Yes.

00:40:54:00 - 00:41:24:24

Yeah. Paul. For sure. On behalf of PA systems. Um, just a couple of comments to make on the on the substations. Um, first relates to construction, uh, phase. Um, given the proximity of these two sites to the aerodrome. Um, during construction, if there is the need for, um, tall machinery, there will be a need for, um, aircraft hazard warning lights and potentially, um, prior prior notification with Bay systems or the use of any of those, those tall equipment.

00:41:24:26 - 00:41:58:20

Um, I think we'll come back to this one under the DCO section. We'd like to secure some sort of requirements in there to to commit to that. Um, the second comment relates to, uh, landscaping. Um, I guess probably something we'll come back on to under item six. Um, the detail on the landscaping around these substations at the moment is fairly light. Um, it's quite high level. Um, and this sort of links into our request for a strike risk assessment. That for that assessment to, um, be robust.

00:41:58:22 - 00:42:15:22

There needs to be more detail on on the landscaping proposed, um, in order to assess how that will attract birds and various types of birds to the sites. Um, I guess we will explore more on item six and the scope of that assessment.

00:42:16:12 - 00:42:20:05

Yeah. Okay. Thanks for those two points. Miss den, do you want to briefly respond?

00:42:23:20 - 00:42:51:00

I feel Roo Williamson, on behalf of the applicants. Uh, the applicants are aware of the issues raised by, um, by BAE systems. And we are in conversation with BA systems in terms of providing information to them to undertake their OLS, IFP safeguarding checks. Um, I'm hoping that will be progressing in the coming weeks. Um, and also we do. We are in conversation with BA systems regarding bird strike mitigation plans, which I think we can probably cover in more detail tomorrow.

00:42:51:08 - 00:42:56:00

Yes. Thank you. Any other questions on the solicitations, Mr. Morgan?

00:42:57:11 - 00:43:29:27

Yes. Thank you very much. Um, two points, both of which I think you've already touched on. Um, the first is that today we don't have a mock up or 3D representation to look at. Um, and this starts to explain some of our frustration over the last two years or so, we, as parish and town councils have consistently asked for there to be 3D representations and mock ups that show it not just from country lanes, with pictures of horses that actually show it from people's homes that they live in.

00:43:30:11 - 00:44:03:00

And we've asked that consistently, and that's never happened with us for 3D representations, which you'd have a much smaller schemes on it than this to see what it would look like. That's never happened. We've pointed out there's nothing capturing the cumulative impacts of the other solar schemes I've mentioned. That's never happened. And today you have the same experience that we have had of having no mock up, no 3D representation to consider. The other is the frustration over the separateness of this. We have Schrodinger's substations.

00:44:03:03 - 00:44:34:13

They're both united and separate at the same time. And from our point of view, we'd never envisaged that there would be a gap of up to four years between them. We always assume that it'd be a horrible experience to go through, but at least you get through it. Instead of that, we've got this gap of four years because of the way it works, and the gap between the station makes that worse. And I understand there may be technical reasons why it can't be shared, but that was never particularly shared with us during the consultation process. Thank you. Okay.

00:44:34:15 - 00:44:36:15

Miss Dan, would you like to respond to those points?

00:44:39:12 - 00:44:46:11

Less than half the applicants. I suggest we talk about the visual assessment as part of the research. Tomorrow.

00:44:46:25 - 00:44:49:06

Tomorrow? Yes. Thank you. Okay.

00:44:52:21 - 00:44:53:06

John.

00:44:53:23 - 00:44:56:04

Council, just just to follow on from from.

00:44:56:06 - 00:44:57:01

What was said.

00:44:57:05 - 00:44:58:10

I know we're going to talk.

00:44:58:12 - 00:45:28:23

About some of the matters that we wanted to give you updates on at the relevant points regarding solar farms, heritage, etc. but at this point, about the the the lack of detail, um, has been, um, a point of difficulty for, um, a wide number of our consultees. Um, in order for them to give us the information, we need to be able to prepare our local impact report properly. And it does seem like an area where there should be more information available. The impacts are going to be significant.

00:45:29:09 - 00:45:35:12

Um, but it's very difficult to carry out that assessment properly without really a basic level of detail.

00:45:36:23 - 00:45:38:26

Thank you. Would you like to respond to that?

00:45:41:15 - 00:45:43:03

I think it's on me to pick up tomorrow.

00:45:43:27 - 00:45:49:06

Okay. We reserve that until tomorrow then. So if I may, just a pumpkin forecast.

00:45:49:13 - 00:46:14:02

Uh, I mean, we're all very aware of parameter planning and how we how that works in relation to EIA assessments. Um, so, you know, we will more than happily engage with the applicants around that. But as I said, you know, we do need to know the detail. Understand that. Uh, and we will take flexible approach in doing so. Uh, but we need that information in front of us.

00:46:14:12 - 00:46:19:07

Okay. Thank you. Any other comments? Yes. Gentleman in the back there.

00:46:23:27 - 00:46:54:29

Thank you. Uh. Excuse me. Gordon Smith from Lancashire Association of Local Councils, EWG. Um, three points, please. Uh, one, um, could just clarify how high are the lightning conductors? Uh, and where they'll be distributed and how many? Uh, the second question was, uh, yesterday, uh, was done, uh, referred to a table concerning the, uh, the permanent area of the substations.

00:46:55:14 - 00:47:36:29

Uh, I believe that's a table 3.26 of the project description. And I'm looking at, um, whilst describes the maximum substation platform footprints consistent with the areas that we discussed today. It still indicates, as it did in the communication, uh, to the, to the public. Uh, last October, last, last, last

autumn. Sorry. Uh, of a maximum approximate permanent footprint, including substation, platform, landscaping, access, drainage, attenuation of 4000m<sup>2</sup>, as opposed to the 80 that's referred to as the building footprint.

00:47:37:16 - 00:48:13:06

59,500 for Morecambe as opposed to 2007, i.e. a total of 22.35 hectares, which is consistent what was shared with yesterday by comparison and more than, uh, their uh, maximum parameters are their permanent footprint. They're declaring a 60 300 zero square metres. So that's a 1.4GW, uh, substation as opposed to 1.5 for Morgan. And they're claiming 164, 63 plays, 164,000m<sup>2</sup>.

00:48:13:28 - 00:48:45:16

Um, and that and that data is taken from the project description of the more than an offshore wind farm. And then in terms of actual footprint of, uh, installations already in existence, Hornsea, uh one and two and Dogger A and B, the total footprint taking a a measured area from Mario GIS, the the entire footprint of the whole compounds for Dogger A and B, a 7.5 hectares and Hornsea one and 2A7 .08 hectare.

00:48:45:18 - 00:49:19:27

So that's roughly speaking seven. And there there are 2.4GW and 2.5GW. So that's each around seven, seven and a half as opposed to 22.35, if that could be explained. Um, and the point about that is, is that the, uh, we've heard today that the D, uh, was seeking to take a coordinated approach and a shared cable, uh, corridor, trying to get benefits. And actually, it seems that we're not getting the synergies from a coordinated approach at all.

00:49:20:14 - 00:49:54:16

And a final observation is that, of course, uh, Lancashire County Council and Wyre Borough Council have made extensive provision and support for such sort of developments at the 138 hectare Hill House Technology Enterprise Zone, which, if they were located there with the existing approved highways, access utilities, segregation from residential and ecological areas, and that direct access to a national grid 400 kV substation.

00:49:54:26 - 00:50:06:12

None of these things would be required. So lightning uh, conductors, please. Uh, and, um, the the disparity in the scale.

00:50:06:14 - 00:50:26:27

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. I'm just wondering this then this question of area of the substation has come up quite a bit in the last two days. I'm just wondering if you could actually provide a note that compares what's proposed for this project on recent similar projects, and then that may then satisfy people.

00:50:28:14 - 00:50:32:00

And we'd have that in the examination. Is that possible?

00:50:32:20 - 00:51:06:06

Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants and we can provide a note. I do want to issue some caution, though, in terms of the comparisons that are being drawn. Um, the differences here are built developments versus application size developments. They are AC versus DC. Um, and also they are coordinated. Uh, sorry, they are not coordinated in the way in the manner that we are. Those are some that they have the same parent company essentially. So there is a different process of site selection that they've been able to commit to where we are not able to commit to that being said.

00:51:06:09 - 00:51:32:27

That being said, the comparisons that are being drawn on with the permanent onshore substation platform footprint. So for Morgan onshore substation that is eight hectares, and for Morecambe onshore substation that is three hectares. And whilst I appreciate they are slightly larger, they are very much in line with what was applied for for those projects. And I do think we have provided a very detailed response on this within our relevant response to to that representation.

00:51:33:00 - 00:51:48:18

I understand, you know, there's going to be differences between projects, but I still think it would be possible to produce a note based on the facts with whatever caveats you need to bring it that would actually, you know, um, address some of these comments and be quite useful to have that in examination.

00:51:49:02 - 00:52:00:18

Yeah. Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicants, we we can do that. Um, can I just confirm the projects where you're looking you're you're asking for us to look at? Would they be the same as the ones that were included in the relevant representation?

00:52:00:27 - 00:52:12:13

Uh, yes, the ones the gentleman just went through it, in fact. Well, any other of the recent ones as well that you think comparable would be quite useful. And then there was two other points. I think one was lightning conductors.

00:52:13:26 - 00:52:19:01

Through Williamson on behalf of the applicants. Uh, so lightning rods. Um.

00:52:21:20 - 00:52:41:29

We do have those. Uh, so the maximum height for lightning protection is 30m, and the maximum number of lightning protection rods is up to 14. For the Morgan onshore substation and up to eight for the Morecambe onshore substation. And that's under table 3.26 of A02 four.

00:52:43:09 - 00:52:56:16

So just just to be clear on that, about 30m is that on top of the who's a gas field technology that's on top of the the building which is the additional height on top basically.

00:52:57:01 - 00:53:19:13

That Flora Williamson on behalf of the applicants, it is a maximum height of 30m. So we've not specifically identified where that lightning protection would need to go. It could either be a standalone 30 meter lightning rod or it could be, uh, it can be something that's placed on top, but it will never

exceed 30m in maximum height. So the lightning rod would be theoretically shorter if it's on top of a building.

00:53:20:27 - 00:53:25:02

So the maximum height including the lightning rods is 30m.

00:53:27:00 - 00:53:32:21

The maximum height for lightning rods is up to 30m. Yes, there are different parameters for building heights.

00:53:33:06 - 00:53:35:26

So the lightning rods could be higher than the building.

00:53:37:13 - 00:53:42:26

Phil Williamson apart of the applicants. Yes, lightning rods will be higher than buildings in order to provide that lightning protection.

00:53:44:00 - 00:53:51:05

How would that work with air technology? If I could ask your colleague about Morgan scenario.

00:53:51:11 - 00:54:07:01

In essence, the same principle would apply in terms of that maximum of 30m, whether it's placed on top of a building, but no, obviously no higher than 30. Or, as my colleague Mr. Williams said, amassed from the ground up, it's a different design of lightning protection.

00:54:08:00 - 00:54:10:06

Okay. Thank you. There was one last point.

00:54:10:08 - 00:54:10:29

I believe

00:54:12:19 - 00:54:27:14

that Phil Williamson, on behalf of the applicant, I think there was a point on Hillhouse, which I believe we've we've covered this morning and I don't intend for us to. To cover again? Yes. Um, it was also a question of coordination. Which, again, I think we've answered.

00:54:28:12 - 00:54:32:10

More on that tomorrow. So. Yes, just for sure.

00:54:32:12 - 00:55:04:15

Yeah. Uh, Paul Fischer, on behalf of BA systems. Um, on on the height of lightning rods. Um, the requirement for a in the draft DCO restricts, um, the height of buildings to 50m above Ordnance datum. And the lightning rods. Um, 30m of failed. I think the applicant response to our relevant representations, they've, um, noted that was an error. And it should be that that should be above finished ground level rather than oud. I think we would like some clarification on On the Heights.

00:55:04:17 - 00:55:18:16

Oud correct height rather than above. Finished. Uh, ground level. That'll be useful for us. I think that the DCO should probably, I think, be more appropriate for it to contain the restriction relating to Oud rather than finish things for all levels.

00:55:19:11 - 00:55:21:07

Okay. Mr. new comments on that.

00:55:24:00 - 00:55:35:27

But listen, on behalf of the applicants. Um, we yes, it should have said, um, uh, above ground level, but as opposed to aaid. Um, and we will be correcting that. Thank you.

00:55:36:13 - 00:55:52:17

Phil Williamson on behalf of the applicant, also just to to reassure that the, uh, project description says in paragraph three, 15 .7.6 that it is 16m. Um, but obviously we will align everything with the what's in the project description and the development consent order.

00:55:52:22 - 00:55:53:07

Okay.

00:55:53:09 - 00:55:53:24

Thank you.

00:55:54:07 - 00:56:20:06

Okay. I propose moving on then to the last part of this agenda item, which is construction compounds, including HDD and the pipe bits. I think we've covered most of this going through the relevant sections of the cable route. There was one question I had and that was around the construction compounds. And what strategy that was adopted in siting them and actually locating them.

00:56:22:24 - 00:56:24:02

Could you explain that, please?

00:56:30:02 - 00:57:08:24

Hillary Williamson, on behalf of the applicants and the construction compound strategy is primarily associated with the appropriate transport links that are available. So the strategy is primarily to use motorway or accesses via motorways. Using the I can't remember the official title of the hierarchy will probably come under traffic and transport tomorrow, but um motorways then a-roads be roads and then minor roads. Um so construction compounds have been purposefully cited in line with that. Um, obviously that doesn't apply necessarily at the landfall or the onshore substation, because those works are bespoke to those areas and to some extent to Penwortham also.

00:57:09:09 - 00:57:14:12

Um, but access is via two compounds that have been based on, on on that process.

00:57:15:24 - 00:57:16:12

Okay.

00:57:16:17 - 00:57:24:22

So you. You have rationalised the number of compounds and their locations. Try to minimize the number of compounds.

00:57:25:14 - 00:57:53:16

That fill Williamson on behalf of the applicant. Yes. We have. I mean, essentially it's in the interests of the of the applicant to minimize the number of heavy goods vehicle movements. So temporary construction compounds do represent some of those high intensity vehicle movements as we establish laydown areas and more storage areas and then the access onto the haul road. So we need to minimize that as much as possible to reduce our potential impact on the on the highway network.

00:57:54:00 - 00:57:58:29

Okay. That's great. Thank you. Any questions on that last item.

00:58:02:23 - 00:58:20:09

So thanks. Um, counsel. Um, I've raised this point on several occasions, and I'll continue to do so. Um, what we really need to see, particularly around the construction management plans and the traffic management plans for construction, is some indication of phasing, so we can understand what the cumulative effects are.

00:58:21:21 - 00:58:36:24

Okay. Thank you. And I believe we're coming on to that tomorrow. So, uh, you're probably yes, you probably raised that point again. Anything else on that last item? Okay. I'm going to hand back to.

00:58:39:03 - 00:58:39:20

Chair.

00:58:43:19 - 00:59:15:26

Thank you, Doctor Morgan. I think that brings us to the end of what we can do today as we're moving fast towards 5:00. But we do need to agree the action points, which, if whoever's doing it on behalf of the applicant, can go through your list and we'll check it with an outline list that we've got just to make sure that everybody agrees. And I would also just say that in terms of tomorrow we've got item six. Sorry. The end of item five. The second half of item five to get through.

00:59:16:07 - 00:59:50:07

And obviously item six, seven and eight. So I think we are going to probably need the full day tomorrow. First and foremost I was being overoptimistic earlier on the way. That item the rest of the items will take place is that we will start by asking our questions of the applicant on the information that we have. So we will be giving an opportunity for sort of preamble. First to explain things will take the documents as being read, and we'll be asking our questions on those, and we'll be giving interested parties an opportunity to comment on each of those matters as well.

00:59:50:19 - 00:59:52:06

Okay. Um.

00:59:52:28 - 01:00:27:09

That was done on behalf of the applicant. Um, given that focus on specific questions, um, and, and appreciate if there is a list of documents that you might be referring to or specifics that you are going to. Um, I do think it could help in the sort of expedient running and our ability to determine whether we can or can't answer your questions. Um, if there's any possibility of getting a kind of advance notice, I think not necessarily around the second part of item five, but particularly in terms of the the EIA assessments.

01:00:27:11 - 01:01:03:07

We've noted all the comments that people have made today, and we were aware of of the points that but if there are some really specifics, um, that you want to ask us about, it is, um, very helpful for us to at least have an indication of where that might be, because we can then have a look and check and not try and second guess. But actually, um, it just makes things run more smoothly for everybody. I think if, if, if we've got a sense of, of what the issues are that you particularly are interested in, so that we can make sure that, that we're answering those as well as possible for you tomorrow.

01:01:03:24 - 01:01:36:19

Yes. Okay. We'll see what we can do. I think nothing's going to arrive until tomorrow and tomorrow morning. In that respect, and I think, I think my general point is that obviously the examination library will give reference to the library of the rest of the things we want to talk about. I think, to be fair, obviously we've got a list of the questions or the sorry, the scope of the matters we want to talk talk about. Uh, in a sense, providing a sort of detailed list in advance, I don't know. It may actually not be possible thinking of time constraints at the moment to do that, but we will do that for the next issue specific hearing.

01:01:36:21 - 01:02:10:17

I don't think actually there's an awful lot of documents we're going to be referring to specifically. Uh, but we'll see what we what can be done. Thank you. Thank you. And in terms of item seven and eight, just very briefly, these can be a short or as long in a way as they need to be, particularly item seven. But the intention for these really was to give a brief sort of overview and structure, 1 or 2 very general matters on the DCO. And to get an update on where discussion is between the parties, and also an encouragement from us for parties to engage on these matters and to put any detailed concerns in their in their written representations, etc.,

01:02:10:19 - 01:02:43:09

if not already done so. So I'm not anticipating that item 7 or 8 are going to be particularly long. Uh, and also in terms of item seven, Mr. Walker might have raises, but earlier on, I strongly suspect there'll be a separate specific DCO hearing at the next round of issue specific hearings. So I'm not expecting a detailed discussion on detailed provisions of the development consent order. And again, for the management plans, that is that is really a very high level, uh, general topic, which shouldn't take more than 15 minutes or so, in my view.

01:02:43:14 - 01:03:16:01

Thank you. Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant. Can I suggest that for the DCO given, we could spend a very long time on it and we could give you a huge amount of detail, and I suspect you don't

want that and that what we give is an overview of the structure of the DCO in terms of and because it is slightly unusual in that it's got, um, it's got the provisions for both parties. It's got some, some, um, joint schedules. It's got some separate schedules. And what we do is effectively draw those out, give a very high level overview of how it operates and why we structured it in that way.

01:03:16:09 - 01:03:18:15

And then the rest of it probably leave to questions.

01:03:18:17 - 01:03:51:22

Yes, absolutely. It can be a high level. I mean, the main point of A was really to give people who are not familiar with the content of a DCO an opportunity just to get the applicant to run through to them what that particular content is to help them engage with it. Over the next few weeks in the lead up to the relevant written representations. Um, so I don't anticipate those items to take particularly long in terms of 7 or 8. Okay. Uh, can we move on to the action points? Do you want to go through whoever's leading on this? Go through your list and we will.

01:03:52:29 - 01:03:53:28

Yes, it will.

01:03:54:00 - 01:04:29:20

Be. I'm happy to list on behalf of the applicants, I've got somebody very kindly sent to me where we've got to up at the break, but I don't think I've got anything following the break. So that might come through to me and then I can update it from there. So, um, from, um, we have, um, the, uh, updates to the planning statement, um, and policy trackers and picking those up. I think we said we'd do those as soon as we could. Um, and we would definitely, um, ensure we'd updated the policy trackers and any relevant policy by the end of the examination.

01:04:29:22 - 01:04:34:01

So I don't think there was a deadline one. Have you got a deadline? One action.

01:04:34:20 - 01:04:42:27

From my memory, I thought we had deadline one. Oh, no, you said. I think after the local impact reports were received and written rep. So I was potentially thinking. Yeah. Deadline two.

01:04:43:01 - 01:04:46:27

Yeah. So deadline to the policy update.

01:05:03:21 - 01:05:04:08

Yes.

01:05:04:10 - 01:05:04:25

Yes.

01:05:04:27 - 01:05:05:12

Sorry.

01:05:05:14 - 01:05:35:10

Yes. I was waiting for a yes. That's fine. Um, so the next, uh, item was in respect of site selection and alternatives. Um, we will provide a note on the cases that, uh, uh, I think you mentioned, uh, in relation to Stonehenge and Langley Park School. Um, so we will provide that. Um, and then there was a question on how, um, material the decision was going to be.

01:05:35:12 - 01:05:46:02

So it was a kind of update note on alternatives with a particular consideration of those cases. And that would be for deadline one.

01:05:51:04 - 01:05:51:19

Right.

01:05:55:02 - 01:05:56:06

Yeah, I think we we've.

01:05:56:08 - 01:06:08:12

Missed out quite a few points that, uh, that we were looking for in, um, under under policy. Um, there was the, um, energy Action plan to be submitted, an update of that.

01:06:10:27 - 01:06:43:19

But that's done on behalf of the applicant. So I think I'd understood that the update for deadline two would be, uh, would be an update on energy policy. It would be a note. Sorry, I should have made this clearer. A note on the, uh, consultation draft of the national policy statement. It would pick up the NPF. Uh, and, um, it would highlight any changes or things that had been flagged from the local authorities on local plan policy that had come out in their earlier.

01:06:43:21 - 01:06:53:05

So it was going to effectively be a, uh, an addendum note on all those changes in policy or updates, um, since the submission of the application.

01:06:53:09 - 01:06:56:03

Yeah. And would that be deadline one shortly.

01:06:56:10 - 01:07:11:19

I think we said deadline two because we were going to wait. Well with apologies. I thought we'd just said deadline two because we were going to wait for the local impact reports to come through from the local authority so we could pick up local plan policy.

01:07:13:06 - 01:07:24:21

Yes. Um, but there was the Preston South Rebel Council. Were you going to provide because they haven't been represented today. So you're going to provide us with, um, their position?

01:07:26:22 - 01:07:30:26

Uh, sorry. So I'm not sure it's for us to provide South Rebel's position.

01:07:32:18 - 01:07:56:18

I think that was just on the update on any particular matter with the local plan or emerging development plan for those two councils, if the applicant at any update on that. Um, if not, we'll ask a question for those particular two councils. Just an opportunity for that to be provided. If there is any update on what you've already got in your policy trackers, etc., in terms of any emerging policies or not.

01:07:57:16 - 01:08:00:18

That information should be available on the council website.

01:08:02:25 - 01:08:18:29

Okay. So uh, is the action then for deadline one to that then requires an update at deadline two following the local authorities local impact report as well. Is that correct? Is that what you're requesting?

01:08:20:19 - 01:08:42:09

I think I think as far as Preston and South Ribble were concerned, they haven't been represented today and we were just looking what is their current position? And as I say, I think you can get that from the council's website. Um, so I think that's a, that's a, that's a deadline one. Um, I think um, except for the um.

01:08:45:01 - 01:08:57:01

The, the, the one year, three and five year, particularly for the councils that are here today. You need to, um, wait to see what, um, what they're going to be saying.

01:08:57:29 - 01:09:15:05

So sorry to interrupt. Inspector John Fowler, borough council. We we have been in discussion with South Ribble and Preston. I understand their current situations. This is something we could offer to provide just an update as well if if that would assist.

01:09:16:20 - 01:09:17:26

Yeah. No, that'd be very helpful.

01:09:18:20 - 01:09:19:05

Yeah.

01:09:19:12 - 01:09:27:09

So so should we leave that that it will be filed. Who can provide that rather than you to save you. Save you a bit of work?

01:09:28:20 - 01:09:47:20

Um, the applicant can provide an update on energy policy, the national policy statements and the NPF. And it would be very helpful for a statement from the local authorities in respect to the status of local plans. Um, and if Fylde could coordinate that, that would be very helpful.

01:09:49:26 - 01:09:53:27

The previous one deadline one. You just said just absolute confirmation.

01:09:53:29 - 01:10:01:21

So if I may, Blackpool Council will provide an update in the LA on their local planning policies and the situation for you.

01:10:02:10 - 01:10:02:27

Thank you.

01:10:04:04 - 01:10:07:24

Okay. Can we move then on on to site selection?

01:10:14:04 - 01:10:20:06

Might it be more expedient if you read out your list and then I confirm whether it complies with mine?

01:10:23:04 - 01:10:24:23

Okay. Um,

01:10:26:19 - 01:10:35:12

you I think you started off by mentioning the cases that, um, Mr. Cliff mentioned, um, uh, and that you provide that and that would be for deadline one.

01:10:38:21 - 01:10:39:08

Correct.

01:10:40:22 - 01:10:48:25

Um, and then we were moving on to the, um, uh, the rating colour, uh, explain the significance of those ratings.

01:10:49:17 - 01:10:50:02

This is the.

01:10:50:04 - 01:10:50:19

Bragg.

01:10:50:21 - 01:10:51:06

Bragg.

01:10:51:11 - 01:10:56:10

Further information on the Bragg assessment. Yes. And that would be for deadline one.

01:10:57:21 - 01:10:58:09

Yes.

01:10:59:29 - 01:11:07:21

And then, um, practical example of, um, how the consultations taken into account in the process.

01:11:12:07 - 01:11:12:24

Yep.

01:11:16:04 - 01:11:32:21

Uh, and then the report pathway synthesis for the HND, um. That was the document that you referred to, you brought up on screen, the, um, summary report to 2030, um, to be submitted to the examination.

01:11:33:10 - 01:11:34:23

Yep. That would be for deadline one.

01:11:34:25 - 01:11:36:04

As the deadline one. Yeah.

01:11:38:06 - 01:11:46:09

Um, there was a parliamentary statement by Michael Shanks. Um, that was going to provide details relating to that.

01:11:47:02 - 01:11:52:21

Was done on behalf of the applicants. I think we've provided all the information we've got, which was in the relevant rep's response.

01:11:52:26 - 01:11:56:03

Yeah, I think my question was, was there any detail or evidence behind that?

01:12:03:22 - 01:12:04:08

Okay.

01:12:04:14 - 01:12:07:19

So if there's anything further I think it's a matter for National Grid.

01:12:08:21 - 01:12:09:12

Um.

01:12:12:14 - 01:12:16:01

I assume that's in Hansard, isn't it? What? The parliamentary statement is.

01:12:17:19 - 01:12:24:00

Done on behalf of the applicants. I believe it is. And I believe in our relevant response. We've provided a reference to it.

01:12:25:02 - 01:12:25:25

Right.

01:12:26:20 - 01:12:35:16

There is a reference to it. I'm not sure it's directly down the side. To be honest, I did, but it is in Hansard. I know that because that's where I went looking for it. Uh.

01:12:36:00 - 01:12:44:15

I think I think we'd like the full statement. Um, and I think I think we'd like to, to be sure that we've got everything.

01:12:44:29 - 01:12:55:03

That is a point, actually. The full text rather. It's just part of it will be useful rather than if it's just the excerpts you provided. It's always useful to get the full text to provide a context to.

01:12:55:15 - 01:12:56:00

Anthony.

01:12:56:06 - 01:12:57:12

For the applicant.

01:12:57:14 - 01:12:58:10

That is the full text.

01:12:58:12 - 01:12:58:27

Of the written.

01:12:58:29 - 01:13:01:09

Statement. It's a very, very short piece in.

01:13:01:11 - 01:13:02:11

Response to a parliamentary.

01:13:02:13 - 01:13:03:00

Inquiry.

01:13:04:23 - 01:13:06:28

Okay. Well, if that's the case, that is the case then.

01:13:07:27 - 01:13:17:02

Angus Walker for Newton, etc. he did then make a subsequent written question really based on the answer to that one about a week later, which might be useful to see as well.

01:13:22:09 - 01:13:25:24

That could be helpful. Absolutely. Can we have that?

01:13:26:06 - 01:13:26:21

Yes.

01:13:27:14 - 01:13:27:29

Just to get.

01:13:28:01 - 01:13:28:23

The full picture of that.

01:13:28:25 - 01:13:29:10

Yeah.

01:13:36:09 - 01:13:47:00

And then next we had to, um, you were going to explain the rationale for the, um, eight km. Um, extended buffer.

01:13:49:06 - 01:13:51:03

Yep. And that's for deadline one as well.

01:13:55:00 - 01:13:55:17

Yep.

01:14:04:26 - 01:14:05:11

Sorry.

01:14:08:01 - 01:14:08:20

Um.

01:14:13:17 - 01:14:33:05

And there was your response to Fylde Council, um, about sequential test, uh, relating to land, which is not greenbelt. Um, and whether, um, this has been undertaken to aid the site selection process. We wanted this to be signposted to the relevant part of the documentation.

01:14:35:26 - 01:14:36:15

Yep.

01:14:36:24 - 01:14:38:06

Be for deadline one as well.

01:14:38:18 - 01:14:39:03

Yep.

01:14:43:13 - 01:14:51:06

And then, um, we moved on to the amber appraisal rating used for the green belt constraint. Um.

01:14:54:20 - 01:15:03:14

Sorry. Uh, it was. Why was the amber appraisal rating used for the green belt constraint? Uh, in the context of green belt policy.

01:15:05:08 - 01:15:11:03

Uh, lays down on behalf of the applicants, I suspect that would be tied into the brag note that was requested.

01:15:11:05 - 01:15:14:24

Yes, I think that's what was discussed, that we could add that maybe to the, uh.

01:15:18:04 - 01:15:18:28

Second item.

01:15:20:03 - 01:15:20:18

Okay.

01:15:20:20 - 01:15:21:05

Yeah.

01:15:24:13 - 01:15:28:14

And then moving on to the scope of the proposed development. Um,

01:15:30:04 - 01:15:41:15

we did ask about the number of car parking spaces. The answer was 75. Uh, or more than 75. Um, and if we get asked for that just to be confirmed.

01:15:43:17 - 01:15:44:22

Yep, I'll do that.

01:15:47:11 - 01:16:01:03

Um, then we moved on to coffer dams, and we wanted a plan. Or you were going to provide a plan showing the indicative positions and heights of the coffer dams, uh, together with the proposed crossing points.

01:16:02:04 - 01:16:04:04

But I don't think an indicative layout.

01:16:04:06 - 01:16:04:21

Or.

01:16:05:06 - 01:16:08:05

Beach works as well as that.

01:16:08:07 - 01:16:09:10

Yeah. Yeah.

01:16:12:25 - 01:16:14:05

That would be for deadline one.

01:16:20:13 - 01:16:32:25

Um, and then you're going to. Yes. That that'd be D1. Uh, you can discuss with Blackpool Council.

Um, use of the access way and provide a notice for the examination by deadline. Two.

01:16:35:06 - 01:16:35:22

Yes.

01:16:43:14 - 01:16:50:02

Um, and then a time estimate for the construction works. And I decided the care home.

01:16:56:26 - 01:16:57:14

Yes.

01:16:57:23 - 01:16:58:27

It's D1 again.

01:17:03:02 - 01:17:13:24

And similar for the, um, sports ground. Um, a time estimate in nature of the impacts on use of the recreation ground.

01:17:15:20 - 01:17:16:05

Yeah.

01:17:36:27 - 01:17:49:26

Um, and then you you you referred to the National Grid tech area agreement. Um, and this particularly, uh, required one project to connect to the western one and one to the east.

01:17:52:02 - 01:17:54:26

I don't know when you'd be able to provide that.

01:17:56:06 - 01:18:13:03

Um, list done on behalf of the applicants. Um, I think we can provide information about the connection agreement based on the tech register. Uh, it won't say anything about the projects connecting on each side. It will confirm the, uh, the.

01:18:13:16 - 01:18:14:01

Uh.

01:18:14:12 - 01:18:23:18

Uh, the connection. Sorry. And the, uh, the connection date for the project. Two of them.

01:18:24:03 - 01:18:37:06

Sorry. You you did say, uh, that there was a requirement that that there was one project connecting to the Western. One project connecting to the east. But your colleague did anyway.

01:18:37:11 - 01:18:52:13

I did say. And there is. We have been told by National Grid that one project will connect into the East, and one project will connect into the west. That isn't set out in the connection agreement. That is what National Grid have told us about where the connection will be.

01:18:52:17 - 01:18:58:03

So can we see how they've told you that? I mean, one assumes it's not a confidential document.

01:18:59:04 - 01:19:01:17

I will. We'll do our best.

01:19:05:12 - 01:19:07:09

I think I think we'd like to see that.

01:19:15:04 - 01:19:21:07

And then you're going to provide a note comparing the size and footprint of the, um.

01:19:23:16 - 01:19:35:07

Uh, the two substations to contrast. And, um. Mr. Smith referred to Dogger Bank A and B, Hornsea One and two. And also Morven.

01:19:38:12 - 01:19:40:27

That's correct. And that'll be provided for deadline one.

01:19:50:07 - 01:20:03:20

Um, and then there was the, um, heights above ground. The final point Mr. Forshaw was, was talking about, um, I think was it 16m above ground?

01:20:05:01 - 01:20:14:08

Uh, Paul Forshaw on systems. I think it was just general the clarification on um, the Heights AOD rather than above finished ground level. Okay.

01:20:14:10 - 01:20:17:15

So clarification on on, on on the heights. Thank you.

01:20:24:08 - 01:20:33:03

And do you want that to include the, um, lightning rods or just generally for sure.

01:20:33:05 - 01:20:37:28

I'll have a beer, I think. Yeah. Both lightning rods and substation buildings themselves as well. Be useful.

01:20:38:15 - 01:20:39:04

Thank you.

01:20:41:21 - 01:20:43:26

Is that something that could come in by D1?

01:20:44:23 - 01:20:45:20

Uh, yes.

01:20:58:14 - 01:21:00:27

Can I just refer to my colleagues?

01:21:02:03 - 01:21:12:16

Was there also a point about a small alteration to the works plans or certainly a workplace, a work plan, number alteration? Does that mean the work plans need to be updated?

01:21:12:20 - 01:21:52:02

But it's done on behalf of the applicant. It's it's, um, it's a mislabel on. So, um, the work plans are in two parts. Um, it's correct on the first part of the work plans. It's correct on most of the plans and the second part of the works plans. Save the first plan. So at some point, um, we will do an up. We may do an update to the works. Plans to, uh, correct that number. I don't think it's important enough that we need to submit an update to the work plans at this stage, but if there are any other glitches that we need to pick up, we would make sure that those are tidied up.

01:21:52:04 - 01:21:54:00

It's it's a very, very small point.

01:21:54:27 - 01:21:55:12

Correct.

01:21:55:14 - 01:22:05:06

You say it was correct somewhere but not correct someone else. And it was just 25 to 17 or something wasn't it. So it's a relatively minor point. So I think that's that's certainly accepted.

01:22:08:00 - 01:22:08:18

Anything else.

01:22:15:13 - 01:22:16:00

Okay.

01:22:17:00 - 01:22:18:27

We didn't have any further. We didn't have any further.

01:22:18:29 - 01:22:20:13

We've got nothing else. Excellent.

01:22:20:19 - 01:22:38:08

So, uh, there was one additional point we raised was with the, um, the appeal High Court decision on the section 106 with Isle of Wight, and the consequences of what impacts that might have on the DCO process in terms of consultation and publication.

01:22:39:24 - 01:22:41:12

Okay. Which item was that under?

01:22:42:03 - 01:22:44:20

I raised it a question earlier on.

01:22:49:20 - 01:22:54:00

So we would be interested in the applicant's view on that decision.

01:22:57:16 - 01:22:58:01

Thank you.

01:22:59:00 - 01:23:09:02

Liz Dunn, on behalf of the applicant, we can certainly respond to it. I suggest it's a matter for the local authority, not for us, but we're happy to comment and provide a commentary on the case.

01:23:09:04 - 01:23:09:21

Do you want.

01:23:09:23 - 01:23:10:08

To.

01:23:10:13 - 01:23:22:09

Provide further details of that in your local impact report, or misrepresentation as to the sort of the consequences of it, and then the application? Applicant respond. Is that a better way to deal with it?

01:23:22:11 - 01:23:26:17

That's less than half the applicant. Yes. Happy. Happy to deal with it in that way.

01:23:27:10 - 01:23:27:25

Yeah.

01:23:27:27 - 01:23:29:06

Is that okay? Yes, we can do that.

01:23:29:28 - 01:23:30:24

It's called context, then.

01:23:31:12 - 01:23:39:09

Yeah. Absolutely. And we'll also provide a regular update on relevant planning applications, uh, during the June examination.

01:23:40:23 - 01:23:41:08

In.

01:23:41:10 - 01:23:41:25

Your local.

01:23:42:06 - 01:23:42:21

Patch.

01:23:42:23 - 01:23:43:08

Yeah.

01:23:43:10 - 01:23:45:03

Yes. Thank you. Okay.

01:23:47:12 - 01:24:16:17

Good. Those are the action points. Uh, a note of those will be published on the, uh, website as well. Apologies. We've got 18 or so, 19 minutes past, uh, 5:00. So thanks for everyone's perseverance with that. And thanks for everyone's submissions. Today we'll continue, uh, with this hearing tomorrow morning, starting again at 930. Uh, have a good evening, everybody. This hearing is now adjourned. Thank you.